

to send the knowledge of Christianity abroad, without allowing him a tract or a Bible at home, hinders and degrades him. It is double cruelty. If any body needs all the consolations of religion, the slave does. He is cut off from the pursuits of other men, and has griefs, trials, perplexities and temptations peculiar to himself. He who has nothing to hope from earth, ought at least to have the opportunity of securing the happiness of a future state. It is idle to say that they receive oral instruction. Of the whole mass of slaves belonging to Christian owners, how many ever receive any religious instruction? A small portion only. And how much do they receive? What is its nature? Should we be willing to throw away our Bibles, and hang our eternal hopes on what our ministers might tell us? Who has not heard our Northern Protestant clergy declaiming against the Catholics for this very thing—taking away the Scriptures from the common people, and substituting oral instruction in their stead? Yet these same persons are sometimes ready to apologize for this very thing when done by Christian slaveholders! Shame on such Christians!

6. But while religion is thus disgraced, and the robbery of Christians is thus nationalized, the amount that is actually paid into the missionary treasuries, as the price for doing this, is very small. The contributions to the American Board from the thirteen slave States, for some years past, have been only about a fifteenth part of the whole amount received. The result in other denominations, is probably similar. Many reasons exist for this. The proportion of white professors of religion in the slave States is less than in the North—the standard of Christian piety is lower—slave labor is unprofitable—and respectable white people do not work at the South, and earn nothing, while they consume much.

7. Those Christians in Michigan who remember the slave as bound with him, and are contributors to the national Boards, should think of these things seriously. They should remonstrate with their respective Boards, unitedly and earnestly, against longer continuing such a connection. It is a disgrace to the Christian religion, and contributes very largely to uphold the reign of the slave power of this nation.

8. Those who cannot conscientiously put in their offerings with the price of blood, should not therefore cease to contribute for the spread of the gospel through all the earth. Other channels are now open in various parts of the globe. The Mendi Mission, the West India Missions, and the condition of the refugees of Canada have claims on the sympathies of Abolitionists. And we may shortly look for the time when the Southern prison house shall begin to open, and the Bible shall there be presented "to every creature."

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI,

Wednesday Morning, June 29, 1842.

FOR GOVERNOR,

LEICESTER KING.

IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE.

The just man in his intercourse with others, regards with equal eye the rights of the strong and the weak. If there be any difference in the spirit with which he vindicates his rights, when assailed by either, it will be seen in the greater deference he shows to the weak. Self-respect, no less than magnanimity, will forbid any obsequiousness towards the strong, any arrogance towards the feeble. And such should be the spirit of a just and generous nation, in its foreign intercourse. If its officers entertain a proper regard for right, and understand the true glory of their country, they will always be disposed to treat with more scrupulous respect the rights and pretensions of a Power, unable to defend itself against aggression, or to resist an unjust claim.

Old Rome behaved with arrogance towards nations that might be supposed to be her equals or superiors. This was wrong, but it was not mean. It was the result of proper feelings—self-respect, a jealousy of her rights, a greatness of soul that disdained fear and revolted at its imputation—merely carried to excess. Had her Senators and Consuls been haughty toward the weak, and servile to the powerful, demanding justice from the former in a warlike tone, but seeking it from the latter, with profound respect, with much long-suffering and patience, they would have evinced a spirit too base to confer upon Rome the sceptre of the world.

What has been the character of the diplomacy of the American people? Any thing, we fear, but Roman. It is needless to go far back into our history. Take our intercourse with Mexico and Great Britain, as a specimen.

The British have claimed a portion of our territory, from the date of our national existence. We have negotiated and arbitrated and negotiated, year after year, until the States more immediately concerned have been on the point of open violence in assertion of their rights. All the while, our government has acted with the utmost forbearance, carefully abstaining from assuming such an attitude as would involve war. Great Britain was powerful—besides she has no slaves, and we have. War with her would be a dangerous adventure for our domestic institutions. So we have borne and forbore, with exemplary patience and good temper.

Again: an insurrection breaks out in the Canadas. Much sympathy is manifested on this side the lakes; which however is kept within tolerable bounds, by a most prompt proclamation of neutrality outlawing any of our citizens who shall attempt to engage in it. Some of them, transgressing, are seized, and sent as felons to Van Dieman's land. A memorial is presented in the Senate invoking the government to do something in their behalf—but forthwith, without discussion, and with many protestations from senators against interference with foreign governments, it is laid on the table.

Behold, how softly we vindicate our rights against British claims; how scrupulously we respect her rights!

Turn now to another picture. A constituent province of Mexico rebels against the establish-

ment. This whole country glows with excitement. Meetings are held to sympathize with the patriots—men, money and arms are sent to aid in the struggle for Liberty!—Tardily comes forth the proclamation of neutrality—and where, in a single instance, has the law been enforced against those of our citizens who violated the rights of a nation with whom we were at peace? The battles of Texas were fought and won by citizens from the U. States. How shameless our disregard of the rights of our feeble neighbor!

A hostile expedition marches against Santa Fe—accompanied by armed citizens of the U. States. It fails in its attempt, and those engaged in it are captured, and held as prisoners of war—those citizens among the rest, the Mexican government presuming very naturally from the past conduct of the United States, and from the fact that those citizens were armed, and associated with a hostile expedition, that they too were enemies.

The American people take fire. The Government interferes at once in their behalf—assuming that they accompanied the expedition with pacific intentions; asserting, on what evidence it is not stated, that they have been barbarously treated; and demanding in a tone of menace, their release.

American Diplomacy talks to Mexico in a very different style from that in which most respectfully it addresses Great Britain. The truth is, our government knows that the former has not power to defend herself even against an unjust claim.

But, we are writing too long an introduction to a brief notice of the correspondence between the Department of State, and Mr. Ellis our minister to Mexico, and Mr. Thompson his successor.

The correspondence was communicated to the Senate, June 15th, in answer to a call by that body, made March 20th. It contains several despatches from the Secretary of State to Mr. Ellis, and a long letter to Mr. Thompson, in relation to the Santa Fe prisoners. This is the most important part of it, and is written with much ability. The National Intelligencer says—"it is not less spirited and national, than its reasoning is powerful and direct." That it is spirited is true; but we cannot greatly admire that spirit, which while it can threaten Mexico, can do nothing but remonstrate with Great Britain.

The letter assumes that the citizens of the U. States, connected with the expedition, accompanied it, "only as traders, tourists, travellers, men of letters, or in other characters and capacities, showing them to be non-combatants;" that they "were taken and held as prisoners, compelled to undergo incredible hardships in a winter's march of two thousand miles, and, at its end subjected to almost every conceivable degree of indignity and suffering."

It admits that enemies' subjects taken in arms may be made prisoners of war; but every person found in the train of an army is not to be considered as there fore, a belligerent or an enemy.

When the Mexican government remembered, that the United States had openly sympathized with Texas; that their citizens had in fact wrested this territory from Mexico; that our conduct towards her had hitherto been marked by perfidy; and how many pretences were put forth as a mask to conceal the hostile designs of adventurers from this country; it was hardly prepared to believe that those armed Americans, associated with the Santa Fe expedition, were there for trading, or scientific purposes.

In the following extract from the letter, the government of the United States distinctly announces, that it will not consider the present struggle between Mexico and Texas, as a rebellion on the part of the latter—and not only so, but that it will not suffer the Mexican government so to consider it—thus taking an attitude, which, in certain circumstances, might lead to war.

"It does not very satisfactorily appear, from any correspondence or information now in this Department, in what light Mexico looks upon those persons made prisoners at Santa Fe, whom she has a right to consider as engaged in the service of Texas, and therefore as her enemies. We must presume that she intended to regard them as prisoners of war. There is a possibility however, that a different mode of considering them may be adopted, and that they may be thought to be amenable to the municipal laws of Mexico. Any proceeding founded on the idea would undoubtedly be attended with most serious consequences. It is now several years since the independence of Texas as a separate Government, has been acknowledged by the United States, and she has since been recognized in that character by several of the most considerable powers of Europe. The war between her and Mexico, which has continued so long and with such success, that for a long time there has been no hostile foot in Texas, is a public war, and as such it will be considered by the United States. It is not now an outbreak of rebellion, a fresh insurrection, the parties to which may be treated as rebels. The contest, supposed, indeed, to have been substantially ended, has at least advanced far beyond that point. It is a public war, and persons captured in the course of it who are to be detained at all, are to be detained as prisoners of war, and not otherwise."

It is true that the independence of Texas has not been recognized by Mexico. It is equally true that the independence of Mexico has only been recently recognized by Spain; but the United States having acknowledged both the independence of Mexico before Spain acknowledged it, and the independence of Texas although Mexico has not yet acknowledged it, stands in the same relation towards both those Governments, and is as much bound to protect its citizens in a proper intercourse with Texas against injuries by the Government of Mexico, as it would have been to protect such citizens in a like intercourse with Mexico against injuries by Spain. The period which has elapsed since Texas threw off the authority of Mexico is nearly as long as the whole duration of the revolutionary war of the U. States. No effort for the subjugation of Texas has been made by Mexico from the time of the battle of San Jacinto, on the 21st day of April, 1836, until the present year, and during all this period Texas has maintained an independent Government, carried on commerce, and made treaties with nations in both hemispheres, and kept aloof all attempts at invading her territory. It is under these circumstances, any citizen of the U. States, in whose behalf this Government has a right on any account or to any extent to interfere, should, on a charge of having been found with an armed Texian force, acting in hostility to Mexico, be brought to trial and punished as for a violation of the municipal laws of Mexico, or as being a subject engaged in rebellion, after his release has been demanded by this Government, consequences of the most serious character would certainly ensue. You would therefore not fail, should any indication render it necessary, to point out distinctly to the

Government of Mexico the dangers should the war between her and Texas continue, of considering it, so far as citizens of the United States may be concerned, in any other light than that of a public national war, in the event and progress of which prisoners may be made on both sides, and to whose condition the law and usages of nations respecting prisoners of war are justly applicable."

Keep this in mind. The day may come, when Canada may wish to throw off the yoke; and some of our patriotic citizens feel anxious to aid her. We fear our government would be inclined to look upon the struggle as an insurrection, a long while before it would risk a war with Britain in behalf of the sympathisers.

Mr. Webster then calls the particular attention of the minister to the manner in which the persons taken in the Santa Fe expedition have been treated, as he has been informed, and after a vivid description of their sufferings, he remarks—

"The Government of the United States has no inclination to interfere in the war between Mexico and Texas for the benefit or protection of individuals any further than its clear duties require. But if the citizens of the United States who have not renounced, nor intended to renounce their allegiance to their own government, nor have entered into the military service of any other government, have nevertheless been found so connected with armed enemies of Mexico, as that they may be lawfully captured and detained as prisoners of war, it is still the duty of this government to take so far a concern in their welfare as to see that as prisoners of war, they are to be treated according to the usage of modern times and civilized States."

Indeed, although the rights or the safety of none of their own citizens were concerned, yet, if in a war waged between two neighboring States, the killing, enslaving or cruel treating of their prisoners should be indulged, the U. States would feel it their duty, as well as their right, to remonstrate and to interfere against such a departure from the principles of humanity and civilization. These principles are common principles, essential alike to the welfare of all nations, and in the preservation of which all nations have the same rights and interests. But their duty to interfere becomes imperative in cases affecting their own citizens."

It is therefore that the Government of the United States protests against the hardships and cruelties to which the Santa Fe prisoners have been subjected. It protests against this treatment in the name of humanity and the law of nations; in the name of all Christian States; in the name of civilization and the spirit of the age; in the name of all Republics; in the name of liberty herself, enfeebled and dishonored by all cruelty and excess; in the name of, and for the honor of this whole hemisphere. It protests emphatically and earnestly, against practices belonging only to barbarous people in barbarous times."

We would call the particular attention of the reader to the 2nd paragraph of this extract. It embraces a noble principle—one which lies at the foundation of the anti-slavery enterprise.

"Indeed," says the secretary, "although the rights or the safety of none of their own citizens were concerned, yet, in a war waged between two neighboring States, the killing, enslaving, or cruel treating of prisoners should be indulged, the United States would feel it their duty, as well as their right, to remonstrate and to interfere against such a departure from the principles of humanity and civilization."

Here is the claim distinctly set up by our government, of a right on the part of a 3rd power to interfere with the policy of one or both of two contending powers, if it be violative of the principles of humanity. True, the case stated, is a particular one, but the ground on which interference is justified, will cover a multitude of analogous cases. Why is interference justified in this particular case? Not because two states are concerned; not because they are in a state of war; not because they are neighboring states. What then is the peculiar feature in the case, which renders the intervention of a third power warrantable and proper? It is simply, because the policy of one or both the supposed states, is, "a departure from the principles of humanity and civilization." And the reason stated by Mr. Webster, why the interference of third parties becomes a right and duty in a case involving a departure from such principles, is, "that these principles are common principles, essential alike to the welfare of all nations, and in the preservation of which, all nations have therefore rights and interests."

If this principle thus stated by Mr. Webster, be correct, then we aver that the systematic departure by any government from the principles of humanity and civilization, whether in a state of war or peace, whether towards the subjects of a foreign state, or its own subjects, gives to "all nations" a right "to remonstrate and to interfere;" for the reason declared by Mr. Webster, that "these principles are common principles, essential alike to the welfare of all nations, and in the preservation of which all nations have therefore rights and interests."

We congratulate Mr. Webster that he has had the courage to occupy this noble ground—on which he recognizes the universal brotherhood of man, and the entire independence and superiority of the relations created between men by their common humanity, over all sectional and geographical, and all party and patriotic denominations. It was on this ground, that several of the European governments, as well as the Executive of this nation, interfered by remonstrance with the Syrian despot, in behalf of the tortured Jews of Damascus.

And it is on this ground, that anti-slavery nations may remonstrate and interfere with this nation, on account of its departure from the principles of humanity and civilization in regard to the slaves. Suppose we take the last of Mr. Webster's paragraph in the foregoing extract, and write it thus:

"It is therefore that the government of Mexico protests against the hardships and cruelties to which the southern slaves have been subjected. It protests against this treatment in the name of humanity and the law of nations; in the name of all Christian States; in the name of civilization and the spirit of the age; in the name of all Republics; in the name of liberty herself, enfeebled and dishonored by all cruelty and excess; in the name and for the honor of this whole hemisphere. It protests emphatically and earnestly against practices belonging properly to barbarous people in barbarous times."

We ask, would not Mexico be justified in such a protest by the principle stated by Mr. Webster, especially when it is considered, that the perpetual chattelizing of two million four hun-

dred thousand innocent human beings, is infinitely more barbarous, more grossly violative of the principles of humanity and civilization, than the cruel treatment of a few individuals, seized in an aggressive attempt on the rights of a peaceful power.

We shall close our notice of this letter of instructions, by giving the last paragraph, from which it will be seen how decided and earnest a tone our government can assume, when slaveholders are to be placated, and when no formidable power is to be provoked.

"In conclusion, I am directed by the President of the U. States now to instruct you, that, on the receipt of this despatch, you inquire carefully and minutely into the circumstances of all those persons, who, having been taken near Santa Fe, and having claimed the interposition of this government, are still held as prisoners in Mexico, and you will then demand of the Mexican government the release of such of them as appear to have been innocent traders, travellers, invalids, men of letters, or for any other reasons justly esteemed non-combatants, being citizens of the United States. To this end, it may be proper to direct the Consul to proceed to the places where any of them may be confined, and to take their statements under oath, as also the statements of other persons to whom they may respectively refer. If the Mexican government deny facts upon which any of the persons claim their release, and desire time for further investigation of their respective cases, or any of them, proper and suitable time must be allowed; but if any of the persons described, in the next preceding paragraph, and for whose release you shall have made a demand, shall still be detained for the purpose of further inquiry or otherwise, you will then explicitly demand of the Mexican government that they be treated henceforward with all the lenity which, in the most favorable cases, belongs to the rights of prisoners of war; that they be not confined in the loathsome dungeons with malefactors and persons diseased, that they be not chained or subjected to ignominy, or to any particular rigor in their detention; that they be not obliged to labor on the public works, or put to any other hardship. You will state to the Mexican government that the Government of the U. States entertains a conviction that these persons ought to be set at liberty without delay; that it will feel great dissatisfaction if it shall still learn that Mr. Kendall, whose case has already been the subject of an express demand, and others of equal claims to liberation, be not set at liberty at the time when you receive this despatch; but that if the government of Mexico insists upon detaining any of them for further inquiry, it is due to the government of the United States, to its desire to preserve peace and harmony with Mexico, and to justice and humanity, that while detained, these persons should enjoy to the fullest extent, the rights of prisoners of war; and that it expects a demand so just and reasonable, a demand so respectfully made by one friendly State to another, will meet with immediate compliance. Having made this demand, you will wait for an answer, and if within ten days you shall not receive assurances that all of the persons above mentioned may still be detained, will be therefore treated in the manner which has now been insisted upon, you will hold no further official intercourse with it until you shall receive further directions from your own government. You will thereupon communicate with this Department, detailing for that purpose the messenger who carries this. In your communication you will state as fully and as accurately as possible the circumstances of each man's case, as they may appear by all the evidence which at that time may be possessed by the legation. In making your demand for the better treatment of the prisoners, you will take special care not to abandon or weaken the claim for their release; nothing more being intended in that respect than that proper time should be allowed to the government of Mexico to make such further inquiries as may be necessary."

OUR DIPLOMACY.

We hope Mr. Everett our present minister to London, will be somewhat more modest than his predecessor, and our minister at Paris. Slaveholders, or men acting for slaveholding interests, seem fond of taking the responsibility, confident, where slavery is concerned, of the support of their government. Thus Mr. Stevenson, in his correspondence with Lord Palmerston, sets up a claim in behalf of the American government, which goes beyond that of the President himself; and Mr. Cass, following in his footsteps, and departing from the fixed policy of our country in regard to foreign nations, makes himself a party in their concerns, and without warrant from Washington, enters his protest against the adoption of a certain policy by France, which, it is barely possible, may indirectly affect the United States. And why this zeal? Because, slavery is concerned—it is feared chiefly, that in some indirect way, its interests may be damaged.

The protest, to which we allude, is a letter dated Feb. 13, 1842, from Gen. Cass to M. Guizot, Minister of Foreign Affairs, protesting against the demanded concurrence of the French Government in the treaty of Decem. 20, 1841, commonly called the Quintuple treaty.

General Cass, it seems to us, would have manifested more discretion, had he awaited advice from those who commissioned him.—There is nothing in the character of the Quintuple treaty, and no action on the part of the French court, that demanded such a protest. It remains to be seen, whether the administration will sanction this new policy of intermeddling with the negotiations of foreign courts.

The plea, on which the protest is made, is drawn from a misconstruction of Lord Aberdeen's correspondence with Mr. Stevenson.—Gen. Cass assumes the "fact and principle advanced by the abolition of the slave trade cannot be executed without forcibly boarding American ships at sea, in time of peace, and that the obligation created by them confer not only the right thus to violate the American flag, but makes this measure a duty." If the best way to settle our difficulties with foreign powers, is falsely to construe their claims, then Gen. Cass has pursued a politic course. Where in any part of the correspondence of Lord Aberdeen has he advanced such a principle, stated such a fact, as Gen. Cass alleges? In no part. He expressly disclaims any right to board or search American vessels—and the only claim he asserts, is, where there are well founded doubts as to the nationality of a vessel, to board her in order to ascertain by inspection of her papers, whether she be what she pretends she is. If this be true, and we appeal to the correspondence for its truth, then the protest of Gen. Cass was utterly unwarrantable; and the Administration will be placed in an awkward predicament if it refuses to disavow it.

APPORTIONMENT BILL.

This bill has at length passed both Houses, the amendments of the Senate having been agreed to by the lower House. Its principal features are, that it requires the division of the states into districts, thereby securing a fairer represen-

tation of the people—establishes 70,680 as the ratio of representation, and provides for one additional representative from each state, having a fraction greater than a moiety of said ratio. It is thought by some that the President, on the ground of this last provision, will veto the bill.

If it become a law, it will reduce the number of the House of Representatives from 242 to 223.

The following table of the present ratio, and that proposed in the bill, will show the loss or gain to each state, and the loss or gain to the slave and free states comparatively.

Free States.				
States.	Present ratio.	Proposed.	Loss.	Gain.
Maine,	8	7	1	—
N. H.,	5	4	1	—
Vt.,	5	4	1	—
Mass.,	12	10	2	—
R. I.,	2	2	—	—
Conn.,	6	4	2	—
N. Y.,	40	34	6	—
N. J.,	6	5	1	—
Pa.,	28	24	4	—
Ohio,	19	21	—	2
Mich.,	1	3	—	2
Indiana,	7	10	—	3
Ill.,	3	7	—	4
	142	135	18	11

The gain is confined to the new or Western states. All the Eastern states lose, except R. Island, which stands the same.

Slave States.				
States.	Present ratio.	Proposed.	Loss.	Gain.
Del.,	1	1	—	—
Md.,	8	6	2	—
Va.,	21	15	6	—
N. C.,	13	9	4	—
S. C.,	9	7	2	—
Ga.,	9	8	1	—
Ala.,	5	7	—	2
Miss.,	2	4	—	2
La.,	3	4	—	1
Tenn.,	13	11	2	—
Ky.,	13	10	3	—
Mo.,	2	5	—	3
Ark.,	1	1	—	—
	100	88	20	8

Majority of the Free States, under the present ratio—42.

Majority of the Free States under the proposed ratio—47.

We shall now make out another table, showing how many representatives the slave states would be entitled to, under the new apportionment, were their free people alone, the basis of representation, as is the case in the free States.

The second column shows how many representatives each state will have under this apportionment for its slaves.

States.	Representatives
Delaware,	1
Maryland,	5
Virginia,	11
N. Carolina,	7
S. Carolina,	4
Georgia,	6
Alabama,	5
Louisiana,	3
Mississippi,	3
Arkansas,	1
Tennessee,	9
Kentucky,	8
Missouri,	5
	68

If freemen then constituted the sole basis of representation in the slave states, as they do in the free, the former would have but 68 representatives, giving the free states a majority of 67 in a House which would then be composed of 203 members.

There will then be, according to the above calculation, 20 members of the House, who will represent property—property in the blood and bones of men. But, the calculation does not give the exact number, owing to the fractions of the free population in several of the states, being over a moiety of the proposed ratio, thus entitling these states each to an additional representative. If we take 3-5ths of the slave population of the whole country, we find, that there are really 21 members of the House, who will represent property, and will stand ready on every occasion to give their support to slaveholding interests.

THE LONGEVITY OF COLORED PEOPLE.

A writer in the Cincinnati Enquirer, gives a table showing the number of persons in the several states and territories who have exceeded the age of 100 years, and upwards.

The numbers are as follows.

"This exhibits a curious fact, that in a colored population consisting of 2,883,458 persons, there are 939 who have reached the age of 100 years and upwards, or about 30 to 40 to every 100,000—while in the white population of 14,888,887 there are but 790 who have reached that age, or about 5,15 persons in 100,000."

"On inspecting the table, it will be found that the slaves in the slave states, generally exceed their masters in longevity. In Delaware there are 15 colored persons who have reached the age of 100 to 4 whites. In Md., 11 to 24. Va., 156 to 66. N. C., 112 to 43. S. C., 91 to 43. Ga., 96 to 44. Alabama, 66 to 34. Miss., 39 to 10. La., 46 to 19. Tenn., 41 to 33. In Ky., the balance is against the blacks, 64 to 33."

The fact is a powerful argument against the Abolitionists—and refutes their slander against the slaveholders, who are represented by those fanatics to be so barbarously cruel to these servants—and is a good lesson to those hypocrites in England, who can bawl out against slavery in America, when their own countrymen are starving in their workshops or languishing in poor houses and crowding their jails."

We have not time to examine the tables, to see if they be correct—but admitting that there is no error, they do not sustain any argument against the abolitionists. The facts adduced respecting the greater longevity of the slaves than their masters, prove nothing as to the treatment of the former. They can easily be explained by a reference to the industrious habits, and simple fare of the slaves, and the idleness

dissipation, and luxurious habits of the masters.

But, as to the truth of the representations of the abolitionists concerning the treatment of the slaves, other facts than those presented in the Cincinnati Enquirer, must determine.

Let us compare the ratios of increase, of the white and slave populations.

The average ratio of the former for each decennial period, since 1790, is 33 and a fraction per cent. The last ten years, it was 34 3-4ths. The average ratio of the increase of the slaves, every ten years since 1790, excluding the period between 1800, and 1810, and the last decennial period, was 29 per cent. From 1800 to 1808, the slave trade was carried on briskly, and this accounts for the fact, that in the period ending 1810, the ratio of increase of the slave, was 33 1-2 per cent.

Now, if the tables of longevity show, that the colored people of this country are endowed with greater tenacity of life—in other words, have more enduring constitutions than the whites, how happens it, that the ratio of increase falls short of that of the whites, on an average, nearly 5 per cent.? It can only be explained, on the supposition of cruel treatment, and by the fact, that slavery establishes among its victims an universal system of concubinage.

But, the last decennial period, we excluded from our calculation, for a special reason. The census for 1840, shows a most singular decrease in the ratio of slave-increase. Instead of being 29 per cent., it fell to 23 3-4ths, while the same period the ratio of white increase was 34 3-4ths!

Will the writer in the Enquirer explain the reason? Does it show kind treatment on the part of the masters? We will tell him the reason. The extinction of the Indian titles, and the opening of new lands in the South West, with the superabundant facilities offered by the banks, gave a tremendous impetus to the American slave-trade—which was relied on to furnish the mad speculators of the cotton-growing region of the Mississippi, with slaves from the Northern slave states. Propagation was hereby checked, and the same voracious cupidity which converted Virginia and Maryland and the adjoining states into an American gold coast; by over-driving, and under-feeding the newly imported slaves, occasioned a horrible waste of human life. If the Enquirer can give a better explanation of this sudden decrease in the ratio of the slave population, we should like to see it. Our explanation is borne out by the well known history of the South West for the last eight years, and by the testimony of Southern documents.

THE GREAT DISTURBER.

Negotiations with Great Britain seem to be progressing very favorably. But, it is difficult to see how they can be brought to a favorable issue, unless the Senate of the United States recede from its position in relation to the American slave trade, taken in the Calhoun resolutions—and unless Mr. Webster finds some way to back out from the untenable ground, assumed in his despatch to Mr. Everett. The American people ought to know, what the press generally will not tell them, that the great obstacle to a final settlement of the questions at issue with Great Britain, is in fact, the American slave trade. Our government wishes to secure American slaveholders against casualties and loss, and will hazard the peace of the whole nation, and dishonor its name, rather than abandon their object.

Read the following from the London Morning Herald, of the 19th ult., and then say whether the free states have no concern with slavery. It must fasten in every mind the conviction, that the American slave trade is henceforth to be the great disturber of our peace, the principal cause of difficulties with foreign powers.

"Each succeeding arrival from New York indicates more and more the probability of a successful termination of Lord Ashburton's mission to Washington. Such probability does not, however, lessen the interest of the public mind in the disputes to compose which that is directed. Of those disputes the Creole case seems to involve the greatest difficulties; not, indeed, perhaps in itself, but in the principle of international law which must govern it."

"The boundary question, McLeod's and the Caroline cases, when once settled, will be immediately consigned to history, there to excite surprise that the tranquility of the world was ever likely to be disturbed by such insignificant causes. The right of search, as also the right of verification, can also be permanently arranged by conventional stipulations; but unless Mr. Webster recede from the extraordinary legal position which is his precipitate despatch to Mr. Everett, he so easily assumed, the obstacles in the way of the settlement, not of the Creole case in itself—for that both Governments could dispose of by consigning it to forgetfulness—but in the principle which is to rule subsequent occurrences, identical or similar in their nature, do certainly seem very great. If involved in disputes arising out of it, and carried on casewise by the Americans, without understanding or common interpretation of the obligation imposed by the comity of nation must at once be come to, and there does not appear, in the entire circle of diplomatic discussion, greater improbability of union of opinion than on this very point."

There is but one way of obviating the difficulty of reconciling the opinions of the two nations—and that is, by a rigid adherence on the part of our government to the federal constitution. By this constitution, slaves are regarded as persons not things—a slavery cannot exist under the flag of the Union—slavery is a purely municipal institution—and there is not a single guaranty in that instrument, for the benefit or protection of the American slave-trader. Let Mr. Giddings' resolutions be adopted—let the Executive square its policy accordingly, & no difficulties will grow out of this infamous domestic slave-trade. Otherwise, of fences must come.

DISTRIBUTION OF OFFICES.

Of the Congress of the Confederation, there were 14 Presidents—half of them from what are now slave states, the rest from what are now free states.

Of the 42 General Revolutionary officers, Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and New Jersey, furnished 28—Virginia, Maryland, South Car-

olina, and N. Carolina, 14—which shows that where hard service was to be done, the free states supplied most of the men, as they did the means. And so it would be again, in case of a war.

But, in these days, slave-breeder take good care to appropriate to themselves the majority of civil offices. The Emancipator gives a list of seventy-six elections of Presidents pro tem. of the Senate, since the adoption of the Constitution, from which it appears, that the free states have furnished that officer, only sixteen times—the slave states, 60! Mr. Southard is the only man from the free states, chosen for the last 30 years. He has just resigned on account of ill health, and a slaveholder takes his place.

PROTEST.

The Methodist Protestants of Sharpsburg station, Pittsburg Circuit, have protested against the action of the General Conference on the subject of slavery, and resolved against remaining any longer in fellowship with the system or practice of slavery, or any religious organization, that holds in its ministry or communion those who practice it. They also resolved, that they concurred in "the expediency of speedily calling a Convention of Protestant and Episcopal anti-slavery Methodists, in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, for the purpose of deliberating on the best mode of action to secure harmonious co-operation in the spread of the gospel, and overthrow of slavery."

PRESBYTERIAN CONVENTION.

A great Convention of delegates from the Presbyterian churches of the West, was lately held in Cincinnati. It continued its sessions through Thursday, Friday, Saturday and the following Monday, and was occupied in the consideration of the usual objects of Christian benevolence, not forgetting the question of slavery. "The full attendance," says the Watchman of the Valley, "and strong representation from different parts of the Valley, that appeared in Cincinnati at the opening of its sessions, must have dissipated any apprehension of failure."

We understand that the Convention took strong ground against slavery. "The report of the Committee," says the same paper, "who strong and explicit, presenting a logical series of thorough anti-slavery resolutions, was nevertheless adopted with almost the entire concurrence of the whole body, one or two brethren from Kentucky alone dissenting. The introductory remarks by Dr. Stowe, the chairman, we regarded as pre-eminently true and important."

Dr. Beecher and Dr. Cox of New York, were both in attendance, and gave their support to the resolutions. From all accounts, they were just such as all abolitionists will approve.

We rejoice sincerely to see at least one branch of the church awaking to its duty on this momentous question.

IS IT A HOAX?

Some weeks since we copied from the Friend of Man an account of the formation of an anti-slavery society in East Tennessee. The Murfreesboro Telegraph, of that state, denies the truth of the statement—and says some of the wags of Jonesboro, have been playing off a hoax on the abolitionists. Will the Friend of Man enlighten us? We will think the account trustworthy, and presume the Telegraph is mistaken. But, let us hear again from Mr. Gerrit Smith's correspondent.

A VOICE FROM DELAWARE.

We see Delaware is protesting against the annexation of Texas. The Intelligence states that on June 20th, Mr. Bayard presented a petition from a great number of citizens of Delaware, of the most respectable standing, remonstrating against the annexation of Texas.

A similar petition from 140 citizens of Wilmington, New Castle county, Del., was presented by Mr. Rodney in the House, and laid on the table.

QUEEN VICTORIA.

Accounts received by the Britannia state, that two attempts had lately been made on the life of the Queen of England, while riding out. The most serious attempt was made by John Francis, son of a scene shifter at one of the theatres, about 20 years of age. He discharged a pistol, but the carriage was proceeding rapidly, and she escaped without injury. Just before the attempt, a respectable woman heard the prisoner say to another man, in a flannel jacket, "The Queen! why should she be such an expense to the nation? It is to support her in such grand style, that us poor fellows have to work so hard."

WHITE SLAVES OF THE NORTH.

John Randolph had a great contempt for the "white slaves" of the North; and seemed to appreciate the great benefit derived from the division of the North into parties. Said he once in Congress, "We do not govern them (the people of the North) by our black slaves, but by their own white slaves. I never voted for but one man (Mr. Varnum as Speaker of the House) from that country. (Massachusetts), and so help me God, I will never vote for another."

At another time he remarked— "We know what we are doing. We of the South are always united, from the Ohio to Florida—and we can always unite; but you of the North are beginning to divide. We have conquered you once, and we can, and we will conquer you again. Aye, Sir, we will drive you to the wall, and when we have you there once more, we mean to keep you there, and nail you down like base money."

And is not this true? Who can deny it? Are not both of the parties driven to the wall? are they not the mere slaves of the South? What are they doing now? One, consulting how it shall bring forward Martin Van Buren, the Northern man with Southern principles; the other openly breaking ground in favor of Henry Clay, as its candidate for the Presidency—a duelist and a slaveholder.

What say the people of the free states—are they willing to vote for the slaveholders' candidates, and thus be "nail'd down like base money?"

ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER.

We are glad to see this excellent paper again started. The first number abounds in interesting matter, and contains what we are glad to see, a fraternal notice of the doings of the old American Anti-slavery Society. We copy the following notice cheerfully.

"ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER"—So urgent have been the solicitations of the friends of the cause, that the publication of the Reporter should be resumed, that the committee have made arrangements for so doing, and future numbers will be published, either periodically or otherwise, as circumstances permit. The numbers will be issued gratuitously. A large edition of the present number will be printed, and sent throughout the country, both to known abolitionists, and to those who have not avowed their adoption of anti-slavery doctrines. All into whose hands it may fall, are desired to give it a thorough and candid perusal. It is not intended to confine future distributions to the list of names to which the present number will be sent, but to vary the list frequently. Still the paper will be sent permanently to every donor: to enable the committee to issue large editions, donations are respectfully solicited. The whole amount contributed will be expended in the publication. Donors can, if they choose, designate individuals to whom they desire the paper should be sent. Donations may be addressed to "William Shotwell, New York," or to William Shotwell, care of Lewis Tappan, corner of Hanover and Exchange streets, New York." Exchange papers may be addressed to "American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter, New York." Editors of anti-slavery periodicals, and of papers friendly to the cause of human rights, are requested to give insertion to this paragraph."

COSHOCKTON COUNTY.

The friends in Coshocton have lately formed a County Anti-Slavery Society, auxiliary to the Ohio State Society. The Constitution, which is an excellent one, has between 30 and 40 names attached.

CURIOUS.

Would it not be curious to see the whig and democratic parties in this State, changing places as it respects their treatment of abolitionists? Stranger things have happened. Last week, we gave very favorable notices from democratic papers of our proceedings, and one generous notice from a whig paper. We now subjoin an article from the grand central whig organ, to show how disingenuously the press of this party is beginning to act towards anti-slavery men.

"Abolition—Mt. Vernon Convention.—We learn from the Mt. Vernon papers, that the Anti-Slavery convention recently held there, was considerably divided upon the subject of political action—many among the abolitionists refusing to co-operate in such movement, and that after the first Convention was through with its business and had adjourned, a number of those present, proceeded to organize themselves into a distinct body, seceding from the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society, and forming another, auxiliary to the American Anti-Slavery Society, and discarding all political action. The Mt. Vernon Banner says the disturbances on Wednesday evening, 'kept them from splitting all to flinders. The first convention broke broke up in three parties, and would have broken up into a dozen if left alone.'—Col. Jour.

There is not a single true statement in this paragraph, except that which respects the formation of another State Society—but even this is accompanied by a falsehood,—to wit, that this new society discards all political action.

FARMERS, NOT ENLIGHTENED.

The West Point Academy has been charged by some, with being an aristocratic institution. Whether this be so or not, that a great deal of favoritism has been shown in the admission of students, we have no doubt. In a debate the other day in the House of Representatives, Mr. Reynolds of Illinois, objected to it on this ground—he spoke for his constituents, who, being plain farmers, are held in no repute by the Southern gentry.

Mr. Holmes of South Carolina, in reply, alluding to the remarks of Mr. Reynolds, that the institution was an aristocratic one, observed— "This cry might do very well among the farmers, but it would not do on the seaboard, and among the ENLIGHTENED people of this country."

And the reason why this slaveholder makes so broad a distinction between farmers and enlightened people, is, that the former are hard-working men, and how they should be enlightened people, he can't understand.

"How should their minds, the poor whose hands are hard, With delving in the earth, unschool'd besides 'In knowledge, labor for the public weal!'"

Is it to be wondered that such men as Mr. Holmes, having the control of the government, should make it in disregard of the interests of these unenlightened people?

THE EAST.

The Liberty men of New Hampshire have nominated Daniel Hoit as their candidate for the office of Governor. A large Liberty convention was lately held in Boston. We are much pleased with the proceedings. A beautifully written address, from the pen of J. G. Whittier, was put forth to the voters of the State. Samuel E. Sewall was nominated as the gubernatorial candidate. We notice that our fellow-citizen Samuel Lewis, who has just returned home, was present in the convention, and participated in its proceedings. His speeches seem to have excited much enthusiasm. "A standard bearer," says the Emancipator, "in the great conflict for freedom, now waging in the West, his speeches in the convention fully sustained the high reputation he has won in the valley of the Mississippi, for rare intellectual attainments, vigorous eloquence, and unreserved devotion to the slave. His eloquence was like the broad, deep, resound sweep of his own Ohio. It carried the audience to the highest pitch of enthusiasm."

We notice with pleasure, that Chief Justice Williams of Vermont, is the candidate for the Governorship, of the Liberty men of that state.

INDIANA.

A large Liberty convention was held at the Court House, in New Castle, Henry Co., Ia., May 28th, at 12 o'clock. President, Dr. J. Idings; Vice President, Charles Paxton; Sec-

retaries, Mr. W. Wickersham and Wm. Bowman. Several excellent addresses were delivered, resolutions passed and the convention then proceeded to nominate candidates for Henry county at the ensuing annual election. The following gentlemen were nominated. For the Senate, Dr. Joseph Idings, of Greensboro, for the House of Representatives, Israel Evans, of Liberty, and Walter Edgerton, of Franklin.

We are pleased to see the anti-slavery Methodists active; they held a meeting at Centerville Wayne Co., Ind., May 26th, the anniversary of the State Wesleyan anti-slavery society.—James Clayton, President, took the chair. The following resolutions reported by the business committee were adopted.

"Whereas, the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church passed a resolution showing respect to persons on account of color, and contrary to the scriptures of Divine truth which declare that God is no respecter of persons, and that all are one in Christ, whether bond or free; in the following words; viz. 'Resolved, that it is inexpedient and unjustifiable to allow colored persons their testimony in church trials in those states in which the laws do not admit them in the courts of justice.' "Thereby strengthening the existing prejudice against our brethren on account of color, and as the said General Conference in some measure, afterwards modified said resolution so as to allow any annual Conference that saw proper, by official action on that subject, to admit colored testimony; and as the unjust laws of the State in which we live do not admit of colored testimony in courts of justice, and the Indiana annual Conference has not taken any action on the subject, and the aforesaid law stands in full force against our colored brethren, we believe it to be our imperative duty, as members of the M. E. Church to lay the subject before our next annual Conference, praying that body to take effectual measures on the subject. Therefore.

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to draw up a petition, and circulate the same for signatures, and present it to the next annual Conference, praying that body to take immediate action on the subject, so that our colored brethren can have all the privileges allowed to any person by the discipline of the M. E. Church.

2d. Resolved, That in order to carry out our principles consistently, we should, as far as practicable, abstain from the use of slave grown produce.

3d. Resolved, That we have 500 copies of a tract printed, containing extracts from the standard writings of our church on the subject of slavery, for gratuitous distribution. Said extracts to be made out by the Executive Committee, which report was accepted and unanimously adopted. Daniel Worth, Josiah Bell and John A. Moorman were appointed the committee contemplated in the first resolution.

ILLINOIS.

A State convention was held May 27th, in Chicago, Illinois, with a view to consult on the propriety of nominating candidates for governor and lieutenant governor. The Peoria Register states, that about one third of the convention was opposed to the principle of political action. The rest proceeded to nominate the candidates for state officers to be supported by the Liberty party, when the following ticket was adopted.

For Governor,
CHARLES W. HUNTER.
(of Madison County.)

For Lieutenant Governor,
FREDERICK COLLINS,
(of Adams County.)

The Liberty men in Knox county, Illinois, have nominated the following candidates to be supported at the next August election.

For Senate, Col. Matthew Chambers. Assembly, Daniel Ashby. Sheriff, William Sanburn. Commissioner, W. K. Hammond. The following among other resolutions were passed.

Resolved, That we regard Mr. Adams as possessing in the highest degree the spirit of our revolutionary fathers, and that his memoirs will fill one of the brightest pages in our country's history, and his name will be revered by every lover of intellectual and moral worth, and every friend of his country's liberty in all coming time. We rejoice to see his name increasing in lustre as it hastens to its setting, in spite of all the efforts of his enemies to darken and defile it.

Resolved, That we regard the censuring of Mr. Giddings, a member from Ohio, by the House of Representatives, for introducing resolutions embracing principles sustained by the decision of our highest courts, and some of the ablest lawyers of the land, and that too without allowing him the privilege of defending himself, as a most flagrant violation of his rights as a member of that body, and another glaring outrage upon the liberties of our country—a deed befitting men who have long trampled upon the right of petition, and who can proceed but little further to the climax of their crimes against the constitution.

Resolved, That we regard it as the duty of every free man to rebuke the spirit of the majority of congress, and to resent the alarming encroachments of the slave power upon the rights and liberties of our country by the proper use of the elective franchise.

Resolved, That the Liberty party enjoys our confidence, and shall receive our hearty co-operation; not only because of the rectitude of its principles, but also because of the wisdom and importance of its measures.

The Christian World.—This valuable work fully sustains the high character it has earned. Refined taste, great industry, liberality and talent of high order, characterize its columns.—We almost envy our old friend his poetical contributions. Its typographical execution is most beautiful.

The Christian Family Magazine or Parents' and Childrens' Journal, edited and published by D. Nevell, New York, price one dollar a year in advance. Five numbers of this periodical are before us, and we are happy to express our entire approval of its appearance and design. It is beautifully printed on fine white paper, and each number contains one fine steel engraving, one colored engraving, and one piece of music, suited to family devotion. It is published every other month, furnishing at the end of the year a neat volume of three hundred pages, and twelve handsome engravings. Its intellectual and moral character are highly spoken of, and we have no doubt the editor will accomplish his design, to make this work "embrace the whole domestic constitution, to define and enforce the respective duties and qualifications of husband and wife, of parents and children, of brothers and sisters." We know of no higher or nobler field of usefulness. The editor has our warmest wishes for success.

S. E. SEWELL.

Samuel E. Sewell, the candidate of the Liberty party in Massachusetts, is a lawyer of great and growing reputation. He is a thorough abolitionist, and a certain class of our friends will be pleased to learn, that he belongs to what is called the Old Organization in Massachusetts.

For the Philanthropist.

TO MY FATHER.

Thou art with me in my midnight dreams—
Oh, that those dreams could last;
Nor waking thoughts press on my soul
The memory of the past.

From the dead past—might I but wake,
To find it all a dream;
And know I am not left alone
On life's dark bitter stream.

With thee, passed all I had to love;
As on thy worth I must,
One thing consoles this orphan heart—
I've nothing more to lose.

Though death has claimed thee for his own,
I still may call thee mine;
Thy being's sun has set in light
That evermore will shine.

And can I wish thee here again,
To suffer on with me,
In this dark world of care and pain,
And sigh for liberty?

Death cannot chill the pulse of love,
Nor virtue's germ destroy;
They drop on earth to bloom above,
In light, and life and joy.

As mothers treasure up their gold,
So I, thy memory;
From all the charms of living friends
I turn to think on thee.

Say, does thy spirit linger oft
Where thou wert wont to be;
Or do the distant realms of space
Divide thy soul from me?

Oh, could I have one glimpse of thee,
Could these dark eyes pierce through
The veil of flesh that covers me,
And hides me from thy view,

How would I rush to those dear arms,
And hold thee to my heart;
I'd soar with thee on spirit wings,
Nor grieve from earth to part.

ELIZABETH.

EDUCATION SOCIETY.

Proceedings of the Ohio Ladies' Society, for the education of free people of color.

The society held its second annual meeting in the new Presbyterian church at Mt. Vernon, June 8th 1842. Mrs. Garrard, President in the chair. After the meeting came to order, the blessing of the Almighty was solicited upon their deliberations by one of the friends.

In the absence of the Secretary, Mrs. Bartlett was appointed secretary pro tem.

By request, Mrs. Garrard read the annual report which was unanimously approved and accepted.

The treasurer's report was read and accepted.

Letters and reports were presented by delegates from several anti-slavery societies and accepted.

The committee reported the following resolutions which were adopted.

1. Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with the colored people in their persecutions, and that we highly approve of their forgiving christian spirit displayed toward those who have so deeply injured them.

2. Resolved, That we earnestly entreat the Christian ministry to bear a faithful testimony on the subject of slavery, and endeavor in all love and patience to arouse the consciences of their hearers in regard to the sin of oppression—and of respecting persons on account of color.

3. Resolved, That although women may not appear in the political arena, it is their duty to throw all their influence in favor of consistent democratic principles, and republican simplicity of manners; and especially to train up their children to abhor every species of oppression—and exert their political power always in support of the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty.

4. Resolved, That in behalf of the anti-slavery women of Ohio, we present to the Hon. John Q. Adams, our thanks for the never failing vigilance and energy with which he defends the right of petition, and the interests of free institutions against the assaults of slavery.

5. Resolved, That J. R. Giddings is entitled to the admiration of the people of Ohio for the courage and ability he has displayed in vindicating the federal constitution, maintaining the honor of Ohio, and defending the rights of the freemen of this country against the encroachments of the slave-power.

6. Resolved, That we rejoice that the great majority of anti-slavery men have adopted the policy of bestowing their suffrages upon such candidates alone, as will carry out with fidelity the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

The delegates from the Cincinnati female anti-slavery society presented a plan for establishing a colored female high school in that city.

Whereupon, the following resolution were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That we approve of the establishment of a permanent high school in Cincinnati, under the supervision of the executive committee. That we consider the plan proposed unobjectionable, and pledge to our hearty co-operation, and appropriate \$200 to its support.

The following officers were chosen for the ensuing year.

MRS. S. B. GARRARD, President.
MRS. MARY A. BLANCHARD, Sec'y.
MRS. S. B. EUSTICE, Treasurer,
Executive Committee.

Mrs. S. B. Garrard, Mrs. Judge King, Warren co.; Mrs. Mary A. Blanchard, Cin.; Mrs. Bailey, Cin.; Mrs. S. B. Eustice, Cin.; Mrs. M. A. Sturges, Putnam; Mrs. S. Miller, Cin.; Mrs. R. Z. Updegraff, Mt. Pleasant; Mrs. Sarah B. Dugdale, Green Plain; Miss Mary Donaldson, Cin.; Mrs. Jane Gowdy, Xenia; Mrs. George Clarke, Massillon; Mrs. Susan E. Waulles, Mercer co.; Mrs. Mahan, Oberlin; Mrs. McNeely Harrison co.; Mrs. Pettibone, Delaware; E. Wildman, Stark co.; Elizabeth Robinson, Jefferson.

The following resolution was presented by the Executive Committee.

Resolved, That we recommend the Philanthropist to the patronage of the women of Ohio, and urge them to make active exertions, to extend its circulation.

Resolved, That the proceedings of this convention be presented to the Philanthropist for publication.

On motion adjourned.

For the Philanthropist.

STARK COUNTY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

A quarterly meeting of the Stark County Anti-Slavery Society was held at Marlborough, on Friday, June 17th, 1842. The President, E. Brooke, in the chair.

A committee was appointed to prepare business for the meeting, consisting of Dr. K. G. Thomas, Lee Barnaby, Hannah Brooke, Peter Akey and Mary Thomas.

The meeting was then addressed in an interesting manner, by J. O. Waulles and John Williams.

On motion, it was Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed to take into consideration the subject of the recent division in the State Society, and the proper course for this society to pursue in relation thereto, and report to this meeting.

J. Lukens, Elizabeth Wileman, John Williams, J. Scott and J. Ware, were appointed said committee.

The business committee reported the following resolutions which were adopted.

Resolved, That the late decision of the Supreme Court, in relation to the fugitives from slavery is another alarming instance of the determination of the slave power to control the councils of the nation; yet, instead of discouraging, this adds new stimulus to the friends of humanity, to labor for the entire overthrow of the system.

Resolved, That while we believe the use of the products of slave labor to be one of the strongest holds of the accursed system, and condemn the consumption of them in ourselves, we should be equally active in discountenancing every law, the object of which is to give protection to slave-grown products.

The committee on the subject of the division of the State society—reported the following resolutions and address to the Abolitionists of Ohio. The report was accepted, and after a discussion was unanimously adopted.

Resolved, That the committee for revising the constitution be instructed so to amend the 1st Article, as to make this society auxiliary to the Ohio American Anti-slavery society.

[The address setting forth the reasons for this measure will be found appended to the proceedings.]

The committee for revising the constitution, reported in accordance with their instructions. Their report was accepted and laid on the table, to be acted on at the annual meeting in September.

On motion, a contribution was entered into to redeem the balance of the pledge due the old State society.

The three following resolutions which had been laid on the table at the last meeting for further consideration, were taken up and severally adopted.

Resolved, That on the great question of human liberty, we can occupy no neutral ground; our influence is always felt either for or against it.

Resolved, That either the principles of Christianity or republicanism, if universally practiced, would immediately banish slavery from the world.

Resolved, That as a consequence, those who are not engaged for the abolition of slavery, are neither true Christians nor republicans; but are in this respect anti-christians and anti-republicans.

On motion, Resolved, That the proceedings of this meeting, with the address to abolitionists be sent to the Philanthropist for publication, with a request for the Standard, N. Lisbon Aurora, and our own county papers to copy.

The meeting then adjourned to meet in Lima on the third Friday in September, at 10 o'clock A. M.

JOHN G. WILLIAMS, Secretary.
EDWARD BROOKE, President.

TO THE ABOLITIONISTS OF OHIO.

FRIENDS—We believe it to be due to you and to ourselves, briefly to set before you the views which have influenced us in adopting the measure contained in the foregoing resolution.

It is known to you all, that the Ohio State Society, of which this has been till now an auxiliary, at its annual meeting held at Massillon, in 1840, by a formal vote, severed the connection which had previously existed between itself and the American Anti-slavery Society.

The reason given in justification of this act, was that the State society wished to place itself in a neutral attitude, as respected the divisions which had taken place among the eastern abolitionists.—The fact was probably overlooked, that in their sundering the ties which had bound us to the parent organization, at a time when she lay under heavy charges of dereliction of duty, and when an array of influence was brought against her which would have crushed any institution not supported by the power of principle, we cast upon her the severest censure which it was in our power to inflict, and thus with others, (though unintentionally on our part) we aimed a blow at her very existence from which she is but now recovering.

A measure, so momentous in its consequences, and touching so vitally the interests of the anti-slavery cause, should not have been adopted without full and careful investigation. But what was the fact. The only evidence which came before the Massillon convention, and that on which it founded its decision, was contained in a letter from one of the seceding party in N. York, and an extract from a partial report of the proceedings of the annual meeting by the editor of the Pennsylvania Freeman. With few of the facts before it, and without examination of the merits of the controversy, that convention placed us in the position we have since occupied, that of aliens to the parent society. But it was said that the intention of passing a censure on that society having been disclaimed, its friends had no reason to complain of the act of separation from it. We have viewed it otherwise.—Until that separation took place, the State society had, from its formation co-operated with that to which it was auxiliary—there had been perfect harmony between them in principles, in feeling and in action. The agents of the parent society, had been the first and most efficient laborers for the advancement of the cause in our State, and had been chiefly instrumental in the formation of the State society. It was the heart which sustained our life and energy, and extended its invigorating influence through the anti-slavery ranks in every free State in the Union. Suddenly, without giving her time to be heard in her own defence, and without even specifying any charge we had against her, we refused any longer to co-operate with our parent society—and why? We would ask you in justice to

consider the question, why was it done? Was it because that society refused to exclude non-voters from membership? Was it because women were allowed to exercise the right of speaking and acting in its meetings? It surely could not have been for either of these reasons, for the State and National associations have in those respects stood on similar grounds.

Certain brethren in the east seceded and formed a new organization, because they could not conscientiously act with a society which allowed women the right of an equal participation with men in the transactions of its business. Immediately after this occurrence, we also separated from the old society, assigning no other reason than as some of our eastern friends had seceded, we would do so too, and thus become neutral. We forgot in our haste that in this case two parties could be recognized among abolitionists—those who adhered to the American society, and defended her from the accusations brought against her constituting the one—and those who separated from her, forming necessarily by their position, another party supporting those accusations. We do not think the mass of abolitionists assembled at Massillon, intended to place themselves in this position; but they did it, none the less; and thus we have stood until now.

The American society, notwithstanding the ingratitude and injustice which we have been guilty of towards her, and notwithstanding the mighty array of clerical power, and sectarian influence brought against her, has recovered her strength, and is now prosecuting the great work with as much efficiency as ever. She has for the last two years had need of an auxiliary in this state, and we have had and now have need of her aid in spreading the truth before the people of Ohio, through her lecturing agents and publications.

At the late Anniversary at Mt. Vernon a proposition was brought forward through the business committee to renege the state to the American society. The question, however, was not permitted to come up, and its indefinite postponement was moved and carried; thus the advocates of the American society were refused a hearing on the subject of her claims. We do not impute any unworthy motive to those who participated in this ill-advised attempt to avert a threatened division in our ranks by preventing free discussion. They were actuated no doubt, by a sincere desire to promote harmony, and to keep out of view a question on which a difference of opinion might result in division; though in their zeal they aided to defeat their own object. Neither the purity of their motives, nor the kindly feelings which they afterwards manifested, however, could relieve those who were opposed to them in their views, from the responsibility they felt themselves under, in justice to the parent institution, to themselves and to the slave, to renege the original platform from which they had been unwillingly drawn off, and again to battle with the enemy as once they did, when the American Anti-slavery society could number its fifteen hundred auxiliaries scattered through every free state in the land.

In accordance with their convictions of duty, a new society was organized, and called the Ohio American Anti-slavery society, to be auxiliary to the National society. It now bids fair to do its portion of the work with its co-laborers.—We have resolved to unite ourselves with it as an auxiliary, because it will place us in an attitude as respects our relations with the parent society, which we originally held, and from which we think we should never have been displaced.

In conclusion, we would say that we entertain none but the kindest feelings towards those who differ from us as to the propriety of the course we are pursuing, and we can freely attribute to them the same honesty of intention which we claim to belong to ourselves.

The Treasurer of the Ohio Ladies' Society for the education of free people of color, acknowledges the receipt of the following sums of money.

Elizabeth Wildman	\$1.00	From Cadiz & Pe-
Elizabeth Rose	25	male anti-slavery
Elizabeth Orr	25	society
Rachel Kesford	1.00	Also from agent the
Lynia Lewis	1.00	following
Mary Heisling	50	From a friend at
Rebecca Lewis	50	Massillon
Ruth Cook	1.00	From a friend at
G. Buckingham	5.00	Farmington
Eliza Templeton	25	From female bo-
Oliver Templeton	25	nevolent society
Rachel Wright	25	Harrisonville
Mary Matthews	25	
Mrs. McNeely	4.00	
Esther Whiting	25	
Maria M. Johnson	2.00	
Mrs. Garred	3.00	
Sally M. Reed	1.00	
Edward Sturges	1.00	
Harriet Coats	1.00	
Deborah Coats	1.00	
Maria H. Gilman	5.00	
Mt. Pleasant cent-a-week	5.00	
society	3.00	
Mary Donaldson	37.75	

Received by the Ohio Ladies' Society for the education of free people of color, the following donations. Collected at the monthly concert of prayer for the slave at Walnut Hills

Donation of friends from Illinois \$2.00
Cincinnati, Jan. 24, 1852. SARAH B. EUSTICE, Treasurer.

LIBERTY CONVENTION ON THE FOURTH OF JULY.

